Application No. 10/042,552 Paper Dated: September 10, 2004 In Reply to USPTO Correspondence of June 11, 2004 PPG Case No. 1652A1

REMARKS

This Amendment cancels claims 2, 15, 16, 47, 48, 50, 51, 53, 54, and 56-58 and amends claims 1, 17, 18, 38, 49, 52, 55, and 59-62 in accordance with the original disclosure. Support for the claim amendments is found, for example, in the canceled claims and in the claims as originally filed. Claims 1, 3-14, 17-46, 49, 52, 55, and 59-63 remain in this application.

Allowed Claims

Claims 22-37 have been allowed.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 16-21, 48, 58, 60, and 61 stand objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Also, claims 51 and 54 are indicated as allowable if rewritten to overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejections discussed below.

As set forth in more detail below, Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 38, 49, 52, and 55 to incorporate the allowable subject matter identified by the Examiner. Therefore, these independent claims, as well as the claims depending therefrom, are now believed to be in condition for allowance.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claims 49-51 and 52 stand rejected for indefiniteness for reciting a coating composition and rinsing composition as part of the coating system of claim 49 and for a typographical error in claim 52. As set forth above, Applicants have corrected these indefinite terms. Reconsideration of the indefiniteness rejections is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 3-14, and 52 stand rejected for obviousness over the teachings of U.S. Patent No. 4,220,858 to Ikeguchi et al. Claims 1-15, 52, 53, 55-57, 59, 62, and 63 stand rejected for obviousness over the teachings of EP 732588 A2. Claims 38-47, 49,

Application No. 10/042,552
Paper Dated: September 10, 2004
In Reply to USPTO Correspondence of June 11, 2004
PPG Case No. 1652A1

and 50 stand rejected for obviousness over Ikeguchi or EP '588 in view of Applicants' admissions.

Claims 1, 3-14, and 17-21

As set forth above, Applicants have added the limitations of canceled claims 2, 15, and 16 (allowable) into independent claim 1 (the equivalent of writing allowable claim 16 in independent form). Therefore, independent claim 1 is now in condition for allowance. Claims 3-14 and 17-21 depend from claim 1 and are also now believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claims 38-46

Applicants have added the limitations of canceled claims 47 and 48 (allowable) into independent claim 38 (the equivalent of writing allowable claim 38 in independent form). Therefore, claim 38 is now believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claims 39-46 depend from claim 38 and are now also believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claim 49

Applicants have added the limitations of canceled claims 50 and 51 (allowable) into independent claim 49. Therefore, claim 49 is now believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claim 52

Applicants have added the limitations of canceled claims 53 and 54 (allowable) into independent claim 52. Therefore, claim 52 is now also believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claims 55 and 59-61

Applicants have added the limitations of canceled claims 56, 57, and 58 (allowable) into independent claim 55. Therefore, claim 55 is now in condition for allowance.

Claims 59, 60, and 61 have been amended to depend from independent claim 55 and are now also believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claims 62 and 63

Applicants have amended claim 62 to include the limitation of adding a biocide to the coating liquid when the measured carbon dioxide content of the sample is at or above a predetermined level. This limitation is neither taught nor

Application No. 10/042,552 Paper Dated: September 10, 2004 In Reply to USPTO Correspondence of June 11, 2004 PPG Case No. 1652A1

suggested in any of the cited prior art and, therefore, claim 62 is now also believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claim 63 depends from claim 62 and is believed allowable for the same reasons as claim 62.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants believe claims 1, 3-14, 17-21, 38-46, 49, 52, 55, and 59-63, as amended, are patentable over the cited prior art and in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejections and objections to these claims and allowance of all of claims 1, 3-14, 17-46, 49, 52, 55, and 59-63 are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Lester N. Fortney
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 38,141

PPG Industries, Inc.
One PPG Place
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15272
Telephone No: (412) 434-3798
Facsimile No: (412) 434-4292

Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania September 10, 2004